

written description rejections.

Response: The enablement and written description requirements are not coextensive and, therefore, situations will arise in which one requirement is met but the other is not. Federal Circuit case law demonstrates many circumstances where enablement or written description issues, but not both, were before the Court. These Guidelines are intended to clarify for the examining corps the criteria needed to satisfy the written description requirement. For examples applying these Guidelines to hypothetical fact situations, see the "Synopsis of Application of Written Description Guidelines" (examiner training materials available on-line at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/menu/written.pdf>). These examples, as well as the examination form paragraphs and instructions on their proper use, provide the appropriate language examiners should use in making written description rejections.

(6) **Comment:** One comment disagreed with the statement in an endnote that "the fact that a great deal more than just a process is necessary to render a product invention obvious means that a great deal more than just a process is necessary to provide written description for a product invention." The comment indicated that the statement is overly broad and inconsistent with the "strong presumption that an adequate written description of the claimed invention is present when the application is filed." As an extreme case, for example, for product-by-process claims, nothing else would be needed to provide the written description of the product. **Response:** The endnote has been clarified and is now more narrowly drawn. However, there is no *per se* rule that disclosure of a process is sufficient to adequately describe the products produced by the process. In fact, *Fiers v. Revel* and *Eli Lilly* involved special circumstances where the disclosure of a process of making and the function of the product alone did not provide an adequate written description for product claims. Even when a product is claimed in a product-by-process format, the adequacy of the written description of the process to support product claims must be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

(7) **Comment:** Several comments urge that actual reduction to practice, as a method of satisfying the written description requirement by demonstrating possession, has been over-emphasized. **Response:** The Guidelines have been clarified to state that describing an actual reduction to practice is one of a number of ways to show possession of the invention.

Description of an actual reduction to practice offers an important "safe haven" that applies to all applications and is just one of several ways by which an applicant may demonstrate possession of the claimed invention. Actual reduction to practice may be crucial in the relatively rare instances where the level of knowledge and level of skill are such that those of skill in the art cannot describe a composition structurally, or specify a process of making a composition by naming components and combining steps, in such a way as to distinguish the composition with particularity from all others. Thus, the emphasis on actual reduction to practice is appropriate in those cases where the inventor cannot provide an adequate description of what the composition is, and a definition by function is insufficient to define a composition "because it is only an indication of what the [composition] does, rather than what it is." *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ at 1406. See also *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co.*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1206, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1021 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

(8) **Comment:** One comment asserts that the citation to *Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, Inc.*, 525 U.S. 55, 48 USPQ2d 1641 (1998) is inappropriate and should be deleted because *Pfaff* is concerned with § 102(b) on-sale bar, not written description. Another comment suggested that the Guidelines should provide an explanation of how the "ready for patenting" concept of *Pfaff* should be used in determining compliance with the written description requirement. **Response:** The Guidelines state the general principle that actual reduction to practice is not required to show possession of, or to adequately describe, a claimed invention (although, as noted in the previous comment, an actual reduction to practice is crucial in relatively rare instances). An alternative is to show that the invention described was "ready for patenting" as set out in *Pfaff*. For example, a description of activities that demonstrates the invention was "ready for patenting" satisfies the written description requirement. As *Wertheim* indicates, "how the specification accomplishes this is not material." 541 F.2d at 262, 191 USPQ at 96.

(9) **Comment:** One comment stated that the written description of a claimed DNA should be required to include the complete sequence of the DNA and claims should be limited to the DNA sequence disclosed. **Response:** Describing the complete chemical structure, *i.e.*, the DNA sequence, of a claimed DNA is one method of

satisfying the written description requirement, but it is not the only method. See *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1566, 43 USPQ2d at 1404 ("An adequate written description of a DNA * * * requires a precise definition, *such as* by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties." (emphasis added, internal quote omitted)). Therefore, there is no basis for a *per se* rule requiring disclosure of complete DNA sequences or limiting DNA claims to only the sequence disclosed.

(10) **Comment:** One comment stated that it is difficult to envision how one could provide a description of sufficient identifying characteristics of the invention without physical possession of a species of the invention, and thus this manner of showing possession should be considered as a way to show actual reduction to practice. **Response:** This suggestion has not been adopted. The three ways of demonstrating possession as set forth in the Guidelines are merely exemplary and are not mutually exclusive. While there are some cases where a description of sufficient relevant identifying characteristics will evidence an actual reduction to practice, there are other cases where it will not. See, *e.g.*, *Ralston Purina Co. v. Far-Mar-Co, Inc.*, 772 F.2d 1570, 1576, 227 USPQ 177, 180 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (disclosure taken with the knowledge of those skilled in the art may be sufficient support for claims).

(11) **Comment:** One comment stated that the Guidelines should be revised to indicate that the test of disclosure of sufficiently detailed drawings should be expanded to include structural claiming of chemical entities. **Response:** The suggestion has been adopted.

(12) **Comment:** One comment stated that the Guidelines should reflect that an inventor is in possession of the invention when the inventor demonstrably has at least a complete conception thereof, and that factors and attributes which provide proof of written description should include evidence typically provided to prove a complete conception. **Response:** The suggestion has not been adopted because the conception analysis typically involves documentary evidence in addition to the description of the invention in the application as filed. However, it is acknowledged that if evidence typically provided to prove a complete conception is present in the specification as filed, it would be sufficient to show possession. The Federal Circuit has stated "[t]he conception analysis necessarily turns on the inventor's ability to describe his invention with particularity. Until he can do so, he cannot prove possession